



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,302	03/01/2007	Shalini Sharma	18037-PCTUS	5040

7590
Lewis J Kreisler
Legal Department
930 Clopper Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

EXAMINER

COVINGTON, RAYMOND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/566,302	Applicant(s) SHARMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Raymond Covington	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/19/06, 10/17/07, 9/25/07</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

There is no claim 9. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for non-heteraromatic ring containing compounds and methods it does not reasonably provide enablement for the broader scope in claims 1, 10 and claims dependent thereon. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most

nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification provides no guidance as to what other rings might be suitable.

Scope of 5 to 6-membered heteroaromatic rings having 1 to 2 heteroatoms is not adequately enabled. A review of the specification shows no heteroaromatic rings described that are representative of actual working examples.

The limited data provides no clear evaluation of how the remaining scope with up to 2 hetero atoms in any array might affect potency to a large or small degree.

Applicants have failed to establish that the compounds tested are structurally and functionally similar to those tested herein or to known compounds having the same activities.

There is thus no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent . Note In re Surrey 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. Also see MPEP 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure- sensitive arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Also note the criteria for enablement as set out in In re Wands cited in MPEP 2164.01(a), August 2000 edition. Thus given the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art

and the lack of direction (i.e. working examples) provided as to what other ring systems might work this rejection is applied.

Though clearly one of ordinary skill in the art could identify much of what is within the scope of the A, the delineation between what is and what is not claimed has not been circumscribed. That is, all of what is claimed is not identifiable. The specification provides no examples of what these terms may signify. The delineation between claimed subject matter and unclaimed subject matter lies is unclear from a reading of the claims in light of the specification. More than one definition of the general term “heterocyclic” or “heterocycle” is accepted by those of ordinary skill in the art of organic chemistry. Some consider cyclic organic compounds wherein at least one carbon atom is replaced by sulfur, oxygen or nitrogen to be heterocyclic compounds, while others of ordinary skill include selenium, tellurium, boron or tin containing rings to be within the scope of the term “heterocyclic” as it is commonly used, and some definitions of “heterocyclic” do not require carbon to present at all.

The examiner directs applicants' attention to the following three references:

On page 282 of the McGraw--Hill Dictionary of Chemical Terms(1990), the definition of “heterocyclic compound” is a compound in which the ring structure is a combination of more than one kind of atom. On page 490 of the Concise

Encyclopedia Chemistry (1993), the definition of “heterocycles” is cyclic hydrocarbon compounds in which the ring consists of carbon and at least one other element, usually, N, O or S. The definition goes on to explain that the possibilities for synthesis are nearly unlimited, and that compounds wherein the heteroatoms are of elements like phosphorous, arsenic, selenium, and tellurium are being incorporated with increasing frequency. On page 594 of Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary (1993), “heterocyclic” is defined as a closed-ring structure, usually, either 5 or 6 members, in which one or more of the atoms in the ring is an element other than carbon, e.g, sulfur, nitrogen, etc. These three definitions should make it abundantly clear that there is no one specific and exact definition of the word “heterocyclic,” thus when this term is present as a claim limitation, the metes and bounds of protection are not pointed out and distinctly claimed. Though the three above-cited definitions of the term have some shared aspects, chemists of ordinary skill would not necessarily agree on the full scope and meaning of the term “heterocyclic.”

Claims 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for reducing glucose, triglycerides and free fatty acids in C57BL/Ksola mice it does not reasonably provide enablement for treating all insulin resistance syndrome, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, fatty liver

disease, cachexia, obesity, atherosclerosis and arteriosclerosis. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The how to make requirement of the enablement statute, when applied to process claims, refers to operability and how to make the claimed process work. “The [eight] factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims”, *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. The main issues are the correlation between clinical efficacy for treatment and Applicants' assay.

a) Determining if any particular claimed compound would treat any particular disease would require synthesis of the compound, formulation into a suitable dosage form, and subjecting it clinical trials with a number of fundamentally different diseases, or to testing them in an assay known to be correlated to clinical efficacy of such treatment. This is a large quantity of experimentation. b) The direction concerning treating diseases is found in pages 2,

which merely states Applicants' intention to do so. Applicants describe no formulations. Since no claimed compound has ever been used to treat any human disease, how is the skilled physician to know what dose to use for each of these different diseases? There are assays described in pages 31-32 but it is unclear if this assay is correlated to treating diseases or conditions. c) There is no working example of treatment or prevention of any disease in man. However, inhibition of bioactivity does not equal treatment or prevention of any disease or condition. d) The nature of the invention is clinical treatment of disease with a compound of the formula 1, which involves physiological activity. e) The state of the clinical arts in treating or preventing diseases is unpredictable.

f) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18, at 24 (In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.), *Nationwide Chemical Corporation, et al. v. Wright, et al.*, 192 USPQ 95 (one skilled in chemical and biological arts cannot always reasonably

predict how different chemical compounds and elements might behave under varying circumstances), *Ex parte Sudilovsky* 21 USPQ2d 1702 (Appellant's invention concerns pharmaceutical activity. Because there is no evidence of record of analogous activity for similar compounds, the art is relatively unpredictable) *In re Wright* 27 USPQ2d 1510 (the physiological activity of RNA viruses was sufficiently unpredictable that success in developing specific avian recombinant virus vaccine was uncertain). h) The scope of the claims involves all of the thousands of compounds of claim 1 as well as the hundred of diseases embraced by the term anti-tumor and anti-virus. Thus, the scope of claims is very broad.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, “A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).” That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 10-22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 67 of copending Application No. 11535779 and/or over claims 1-7, 9-12, 14 of copending Application No. 11841508. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they differ only in the chalcogen use in the linking group, oxygen vs. sulfur. The use of one chalcogen in lieu of another would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as such could be readily envisaged and the results would not have been unexpected.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres at telephone number (571) 272-0867.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/R. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

/Janet L. Andres/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 1625